UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,883	06/17/2005	Jaehwan Eun	DE1642 1957	
1109 ANDERSON, I	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1251 AVENUE	OF THE AMERICAS		KUNEMUND, ROBERT M	
NEW YORK,, NY 10020-1182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1722	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/539,883	EUN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Robert M. Kunemund	1722			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
		action is non-final.				
· <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
· 6)⊠	· 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.					
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner	ſ.				
10) 🔲	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b)⊡ objected to by the E	xaminer.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date see paper. Attachment(s) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date see paper. Other:						

Art Unit: 1722

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dhote et al (5,777,356).

The Dhote et al reference teaches a method of making a ferroelectric cell on a substrate, note entire reference. On a silicon substrate a first layer is deposited onto the substrate. The material is a metal oxide. A ferroelectric single crystal is then deposited on the metal oxide electrode layer. The ferroelectric can be deposited by MOCVD, note examples. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the metal oxide layer being a perovskite. However, in the absence of unexpected

results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable structure of the metal oxide in the Dhote et al reference in order to align the ferroelectric layer, noting that the reference does teach different metal oxide layers and structures.

Claims 2, 5 to 7, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dhote et al (5,777,356).

The Dhote et al reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs form the instant claims in the layer thickness, and material type. However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable thickness and materials of the structure in the Dhote et al reference in order to create the desired circuit material.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert M Kunemund
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1722

RMK